

**REMARKS**

At the outset, appreciation is expressed to Examiner Trinh for his careful examination of this application. However, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Independent Claim 1 is rejected as being unpatentable based on the disclosures in U.S. Patent No. 5,598,032, hereinafter Fidalgo, and U.S. Patent No. 5,640,306, hereinafter Gaumet.

Amended Claim 1 recites a method including the step of producing, on a support sheet, the antenna with at least two turns and a pair of connection pads in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the pair of connection pads. This claim amendment is fully supported by this application's disclosure. For example, as illustrated in the figures, no turns of the antenna 11 are disposed between the pair of connection pads 12.

By contrast, as clearly seen, for example in Fidalgo's Figs. 1 and 2, the turns of the antenna 5 are disposed between the contact terminals 15 (which the Examiner deems to correspond to connection pads). Thus, Fidalgo does not disclose producing an antenna with at least two turns and a pair of connection pads in a layout in which no turns of the antenna are disposed between the pair of connection pads. Moreover, Gaumet does not cure this deficiency in Fidalgo.

Claim 1 also recites electrically connecting at least one of the ends of the antenna to a respective one of the connection pads by means of a bridge disposed on a surface of the turns that is away from the support sheet. The Examiner correctly notes that Fidalgo does not disclose this aspect of the recited method, but goes on to rely on Gaumet for allegedly teaching connecting Fidalgo's terminals 15

by a bridge disposed on a surface of the turns. Gaumet discloses a conductive glue 10 for electrically connecting a conductive element 6 to a conductive element 11. The Examiner refers to Gaumet's conductive glue 10 as a bridge and the conductive element 11 as a turn. However, if Gaumet's conductive glue 10 were placed on Fidalgo's antenna turns to connect the terminals 15, there would clearly be a short circuit and the device would no longer function. Thus, an ordinarily skilled artisan would not have found it obvious to modify Fidalgo's device in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, amended Claim 1 is clearly allowable over the disclosures in Fidalgo and Gaumet, and withdrawal of the rejections of those claims is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 47, 52 and 54-56 are also rejected as being unpatentable based on the above-discussed combination of the disclosures in Fidalgo and Gaumet. However, for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, it would not have been obvious to modify Fidalgo's device in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Moreover, amended Claims 47, 54 and 55 each recite that a conductive segment crosses over at least one turn of the at least two turns while being electrically insulated from the at least one turn of the at least two turns, while Claims 52 and 56 each recite a conductive element electrically insulated from the turns and crossing over or under at least one turn of the at least two turns.

With respect to Claims 47, 52 and 54-56, the Examiner evidently believes that Gaumet's conductive glue 10 corresponds to a conductive segment/element, that Gaumet's conductive element 11 corresponds to a turn. However, it is clear

from a carefully study of Gaumet's disclosures that the conductive glue 10 provides an electrical connection to the conductive element 11 and therefore is not electrically insulated from the conductive element 11. Thus, even assuming some basis existed for the Examiner's combination of the disclosures in Fidalgo and Gaumet, independent Claims 47, 52 and 54-56 are nevertheless each clearly patentably distinguishable.

For the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 47, 52 and 54-56 is also respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 7, 2010

By: /Peter T. deVore/  
Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60361

Customer No. 21839  
703 836 6620